

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, and 17 remain pending in this application. Claim 7 has been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,437,040 (*Campbell*). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 7 calls for a system comprising a delay circuit and a detection circuit. The delay circuit is configured to receive a standby signal from a power supply, wherein the delay circuit is configured to deliver a delayed standby signal a predetermined period of time after receiving the standby signal. The detection circuit is configured to receive the delayed standby signal, wherein the detection circuit is configured to deliver a control signal for the power supply in response to receiving the delayed standby signal.

Figure 1 of *Campbell* includes a power supply module 17 that has two components, an AC module 18 and a converter module 20. Figure 1 of *Campbell* further illustrates that the AC module 18 of the power supply module 17 provides and receives a variety of signals to and from the control module 22. Among other things, the AC module 18 provides a 12 V standby signal to the control module 20, and receives a DCON signal from the AC module 18. The AC module 18 forwards the unmodified DCON signal to the converter module 20.

According to the Examiner, *Campbell* teaches all of the elements of claim 7. In particular, the Examiner argues that *Campbell*'s power supply module 17, which includes the AC module 18 and the converter module 20, corresponds to both the "detection circuit" as well as to the "power supply" of claim 7. The Examiner further asserts that the control module 22 of

signal, wherein the detection circuit is configured to deliver a control signal to the power supply in response to receiving the delayed standby signal.

The Examiner asserts that in *Campbell*, the “delayed standby signal” corresponds to the DCON signal transmitted from the control module 22 to the AC module 18, and the “control signal” corresponds to the DCON signal transmitted from the AC module 18 to the converter module 20. If the “detection circuit” (*i.e.*, AC module 18) is part of the “power supply” (*i.e.*, the supply module 17) as the Examiner earlier asserted with respect to the “delay circuit” element, then under the Examiner’s application of *Campbell*, it is the power supply (and not the “detection circuit”) that receives the delayed standby signal. Moreover, under the Examiner’s application of *Campbell*, the detection circuit (or AC module 18) cannot provide the control signal to the power supply (supply module 17), as the supply module 17 already has the DCON signal because, according to the Examiner, the AC module 18 is part of the supply module 17.

Thus, the above analysis highlights the glaring flaw in the Examiner’s application of *Campbell*, particularly when the reference is applied in the manner called for by the Examiner to ALL of the claimed features. For example, for the purposes of applying *Campbell* to the “delay circuit” element, the Examiner argues that the “AC module 18” is actually the “power supply” (because claim 7 calls for the “delay circuit” configured to receive a standby signal from the “power supply”). However, for the purposes of applying *Campbell* to the “detection circuit” element, the Examiner switches directions and argues that the “AC module 18” is really a “detection circuit,” and not the power supply (because claim 7 states that the detection circuit (and not the power supply) receives the delayed standby signal). Furthermore, claim 7 calls for

the “detection circuit” to provide the control signal to the “power supply.” Under the Examiner’s application of *Campbell*, the control signal (*i.e.*, the DCON signal from the AC module 18 to the converter module 20) is provided within the power supply (*i.e.*, from the AC module 18 to the converter module 20), and not from a “detection circuit” to the “power supply,” as called for claim 7. In view of at least these deficiencies, claim 7 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 8, which depends from claim 7, is further allowable for the additional claim features recited therein. For example, claim 8 calls for a stabilizer circuit configured to receive the standby signal and to receive the control signal. The Examiner argues that Figures 3 and 4 of *Campbell* illustrate the stabilizer circuit. According to *Campbell*, Figures 3 and 4 depict a detailed embodiment of the AC module 18 of Figure 1. *See Campbell*, col. 7, lines 48-51. According to the Examiner, the AC module 18 provides the 12SB (standby signal) to the control module 22 (delay circuit). However, claim 8 calls for the stabilizer circuit to receive the standby signal and the control signal. As shown in Figure 1 of *Campbell*, the AC module 18 does not receive the 12SB signal (standby signal), but rather provides it to the control module 22. Similarly, the “control signal” according to the Examiner corresponds to the DCON signal that is provided by (not received by) the AC module 18. Accordingly, for these further reasons, claim 8 is allowable.

Applicant acknowledges that the Examiner allowed claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 17. In light of the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 7-9 are allowable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance,  
the undersigned attorney hereby requests an interview with the Examiner to discuss the steps  
necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C.  
CUSTOMER NO. 23720

Date: December 22, 2003

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Ruben S. Bains, Reg. No. 46,532  
10333 Richmond, Suite 1100  
Houston, Texas 77042  
(713) 934-7000  
(713) 934-7011 (facsimile)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)